FILE NO 67 OF 1898
SL NO 28-41

Infant Marriage.

G. R. S. 59] GPB—15,000—20-12-13

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

1898-99
~~191~~
(Police

File No. 67

Serial Nos. 28, 29, 36 — 41.

~~Papers Filed.~~ B

Month ~~January~~ 1900

SUBJECT.

prosecution in the case of an infant marriage which took place at Irgampalli

M. S. Krishnamachari

PREVIOUS REFERENCES.

LATER REFERENCES.

Commenced

SECTION [illegible]

FILE No. [illegible]

SERIAL No. [illegible]

Sub. Hours ⑧

Who the Prov
of ... was is not stated
the Taluq Supt. was
evidently responsible
for the drawing up
of the charge sheet &
his evidence & prose-
cute the case
from & ascribed
by the Dt. Magte &
an oversight.

3/11/88

The Subdivisional Officer
— Main case explained
Cancellation as well
as of 4 other matters.
The Local Police are
responsible for the
suppression to Prosecute
the Subdivision. Direction to
be reported that the
suppression was not
observed in future &
Reports Rejected by
the Court of Sessions.

⑧

The D.G.P. may be
asked to call
due notice of
the conduct
of the Officer or
Officers at fault.

ar by the Municipal
Magistrate. He must
not let the man
— must look alive
a little more. Now
a year ago it was
Grand. You not-
now neglecting the
Queen's & giving
effect to the sanction
accorded by Govt.

The Prosecution
of the leaders & the
men under them
Mr. Anderson has made
which I have called
for.

Dublin Castle
4
2 — 11 — 89

411

The husband instead
of being prosecuted in accord
with the first sanction was
treated as a witness for the
pros. — In this unfortunate the
Town Inspt of Constabulary is
responsible. The Inspt's report should be
followed & not the contrary. The first of the
2 murders shows that there was an
honest effort concerted by the Police and public
— men — & the leaders & the —

the landlord ordered the sheriff
to eject the tenants and
took the advice of the bailiff
as soon as 8 pm he was
not to blame — In this case
I will not prosecute the landlord

81

Dr Anderson 4 — 11 — 89

Mr Balfour 5/11

Sub. & 1st Comm.

When the proc(6)
was instituted in the
case there was an Asst.
Insp- in Chintamani
and he has since
retired & his perma-
-nent place of Gundai
of Sidlaghatta. He
explains that he does not
remember that he ever
saw order & prosecute
6 persons in the case. The
order rec'd. by him include
5 names & he has prose-
-cuted them all. He ap
-pears to have been at
some disadvantage in
furnishing his explan
-ation without the
help of the original
orders bearing on the
case. From the copies

Sidl.
Submit to
Secy. as the
file appears
to have come
back owing
from the 1st
Comm.r

8/11

Submitted.
mk
8/11
Please see order
on the opposite
note 4
12-11-29

13/11.

Hunt reg. It would appear that the Pres. Sup. W. Landing sent a copy of the Gov. Prop. to Gen. Gov. enclosed in a Canarese order & the accident. The latter order did not specify the persons the prosecutes. The Ag. Insp. was left to gather this information as best he could from the Gov. Prop English. He does not know English.

10/1/20

12762
The Report cannot be dealt satisfactorily. The Insp. & the Asst. Insp. should go all Hassan. Copy of Kadi's letter will be sent to Insp. when

Dr
11/1/1920

Ag. Insp. to see.
12/1/20

See Sheet No. 1
draft in appd. Ref 24/6.

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
11621
17 JUN 99
1899

J 1462

From

The Inspector General of Police
in Mysore.

To

The Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore,
General and Revenue Depts.

(1)

DN police

FILE No. S. & P. 99

SERIAL No. 3

Dated

Despatched 15 June 1899

Received

General No. 4623

No. 389

Enclosure No. 4 & 4 to Rep.

Recommending the prosecution of the parties concerned in an infant marriage that took place at Bagepalli Chintamani taluk on.

Sd
17.6.99

OFFICE OF THE

INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE IN MYSORE.

No. 4623/389 Dated ...15th... June ...189

Enc. 4 & a file of Records.

FROM

THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE IN MYSORE.

To

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVT. OF MYSORE,
GENERAL AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS.

SIR,

I have the honor to forward herewith for perusal and obliging return, dockets nos. 197 and 403 dated 10-12-1898 and 5-6-1899 with memo and vernacular records from the Deputy Commissioner, Kolar, reporting on the occurrence of an Infant marriage at Dragampalli, Chintamani Taluq, on 29-8-1898.

2. The Police enquiry shows that the parties are Komaties by caste, that one Bochu Ramiah of Narigampalli, Punganur Taluq, North Arcot District, gave his daughter Venkatalakshmi aged 7 years, 2 months and 29 days

days to one Anniya aged 28 years, son of Kom
Subbaya of Iragampalli; that the marriage w
arranged and celebrated by Subbiya father
the bridegroom, Adiappa uncle of the bridegro
Kondappa Sastry, Bagavum Rungiah and Boc
Ramiah father of the bride; that one Varaha
acted as purohit. The said persons admi
having brought about the marriage and ta
a leading part in it.

3. Under these circumstances I beg
that sanction may be accorded to the prosecu
of the marginally noted persons under Section
of Regulation X of 1894

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient Servan

K. Muandy

Inspector General of Police.

(1) Anniya, the bridegroom.
2. Subbiya father of the bridegroom.
3. Adiappa uncle of the bridegroom.
4. Varahaiappa, Purohit and Patel of Ettamaranahally.
5. Kondappa Sastry
6. Bagavum Rangiah

The father of the bride has been omitted as he lives in British India.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE.

police

FILE No. 67898 99

(2)

READ—

Letter No. 4623-389 SERIAL No. 229 dated the 15th June 1899,

from the Inspector General of Police in Mysore,

reporting that on the 29th August 98 an infant girl of 7 years, 2 months & 29 days old named Venkatalakshmi, daughter of Bochu Ramiah of Nirigampalli, Punganur Taluk, North Arcot District, was married to one Anniga aged 28 years, son of Konti Subbayya of Iraganpalli, Chintamani Taluk at Iraganpalli.

ORDER THEREON No. 1480 J1773. DATED BANGALORE 30 June 1899

Under the provisions of Section 8 of Regulation X of 1894, the Government are pleased to direct the prosecution, for offences under Section 3 of the Mysore Infant Marriages Prevention Regulation, of the marginally noted persons who caused the marriage of the infant girl named Venkatalakshmi with a man named Anniga or knowingly aided and abetted the same, and of the said husband Anniga.

1. Subbayya, father of the bridegroom.
2. Adikappa, uncle of do
3. Narasimappa, Purohit Hales.
4. Kum Venkatappa Shastri } abettors.
5. Punganur Punchaiti }

2/6/99

Draft Secretary

To —The Deputy Commissioner, Kolar District.
The Inspector-General of Police in Mysore. (returning the original enclosures.

with reference to his No. 4623-389 dated 15th June 99.

SP 2/6 2 June 99 2/6

Sub. Heard with draft for appl. GR 22/9.

OFFICE OF THE ... 2601 19-9-99 SECRETARIAT

J. 299

1899

From

The Inspector General of Police in Mysore.

To

The Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore, General and Revenue Depts.

(3)

Dated

Despatched 16 September

Received 19/9

General No. 1229

No. 97

Enclosure No.

Subject police

File No. 67 of 18-11

Reporting the conviction of parties concerned in an infanticide case that took place at Yeguripalli in the Chikka-mani taluk & stating that Comm Kolar has been asked to report why the other accused persons including the husband were not convicted.

Ind 19.9.99

references put up Bdl. 21-9-99

OFFICE OF THE

INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE IN MYSORE.

1229/97

Dated Bangalore 16 Sept. 1899

FROM

THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE IN MYSORE.

To

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVT. OF MYSORE,
GENERAL AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS.

SIR,

With reference to Government Proceedings No 14805/J. 1773 dated 30 June/99 Sanctioning the prosecution of the parties concerned in an infant marriage that took place at Irgampalli in the Chintamani Taluk, I have the honor to state that the Deputy Commissioner Kolar, reports that only the marginally

1. Kondappa Sastri — Abettor Rs 10/-

2. Narahappa, Purohit and Patel — Rs 5/- each

marginally noted 2 individuals were Convicted, and Sentenced to pay, a fine of ~~Rs~~ 5/-, and Rs 10/- respectively

2 The Deputy Commissioner has been asked to report why the other accused persons including the husband were not Convicted, and to forward Copy of Judgment of the District Magistrate. A further reference will be made to Government on their receipt

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

your most obedient Servant

K. Ananda

for Inspector General of Police

A.

Proceedings of the Government of Mysore.

Police

67 & 98-99

37

(4)

READ:—

Letter No. 1229/97 dated the 1st September 1899, from the Inspector General of Police in Mysore, reporting with reference to Government Proceedings No. 14805/91773 dated the 30th June 1899 sanctioning the prosecution of the parties concerned in an infant marriage that took place at Iragampalli, Chintamani Taluk that the marginally noted individuals were convicted by the District Magistrate of Kolar and sentenced to pay a fine of Rs. 54-10 each and in default to undergo ~~simple imprisonment for~~, and stating that ~~the Sheristadar has been asked to report why the accused persons had not convicted and that~~ further reference will be made on the receipt of a reply thereto in the case, the papers of the D.M. Kolar which has been called for

Nanjaraya Shetty
Nanjappa Shetty

ORDER THEREON No. 4088/J.348

Dated Bangalore 25/9/1899

RECORDED.

Secretary.

To—The Inspector General of Police in Mysore.

SN 2/9/99

3361
9-10-99

J.387

1899

From

The Inspector General of Police
in Mysore.

To

The Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore,
General and Revenue Depts.

(5)

SECTION—police
FILE No. 62898-99
SERIAL No. 38

Dated
Despatched 6 October 1899.
Received

General No. 1533
No. 125

Enclosure No. 2

Forwarding copy of docket-
No 6 of 19 September 1899 from
Dy Commr Kolar together
with its enclosure in original
in the pending case Infant-
Marriage etcat Coolgoor
al- Organpalli in Cole
Circle Kolar for

Submitted for orders.

27/10.

OFFICE OF THE

INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE IN MYSORE.

No. 1533/125 Dated Bangalore, 1, October

Enc. 2

FROM

THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE IN MYSORE.

To

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVT. OF MYSORE,
GENERAL AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS.

SIR,

With reference to Government
Proceedings no: 4088/J 348 dated the 25th ultimo,
regarding the conviction of only 2 of the 6 ~
persons noted in the margin, concerned in the
case of an Infant marriage that took place
at Irgampalli village, Chintamani Taluq,
I have the honor to forward herewith copy
of docket no: 76 of the 19th September 1899 from
the Deputy Commissioner, Kolar, together with
its enclosure in original (a copy of the judgment

1. Sulliah.
2. Adiappa.
3. Narahariappa. } convicted by Magistrate.
4. Venkappa Setty }
5. Ramaiah.
6. Anniaya.

in the case) reporting that the accused persons 2 and 5 were acquitted by the District Magistrate for want of sufficient evidence and that through the oversight of the Police Inspector of Chintamani the husband of the Infant bride (No: 6 in the margin) was omitted to be prosecuted.

2. It will be observed from the Judgment of the District Magistrate that the father of the Infant bride and Anniya, the bridegroom have been examined as witnesses in spite of the statements of the accused persons 1 to 4, that the latter settled the preliminaries of his own marriage. If the memo and notes of evidence sent up when applying for sanction had been referred to by the Prosecuting officer or perused by the District Magistrate, the strange incident of the conviction of two outsiders in the shape of the astrologer and of the Purohit, while the

the bridegroom and his relations actually interested and concerned in the celebration of the marriage could not have occurred. The Police Superintendent who is responsible for carefully arranging the conduct of the case from start to finish, is to blame for the miscarriage of justice. As the marriage is stated to have occurred so long ago as 29th August 1898, it does not appear to me to be desirable to order the prosecution of the father of the bride and of the bridegroom.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

K. Lumley

for Inspector General of Police.

Encl to Ltr No 720/533 — 596-10 dt 13/125

189 9

FROM The Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District.

To The Inspector General of Police
in Mysore.

Dated 19th
Despatched 20th } September 1899
Received

General No. 76
No.

Enclosure No.

His docket no 1225/69 of the
16th instant

Has the honor to forward
herewith copy of judgment in
Criminal case no. 1 of 1899-1900
on the file of the District Magis-
-trate of Kolar, Government to
Subbanja and 4 others and to
State that the other accused
viz. 1st, 2nd and 5th were
acquitted as there was not
sufficient evidence against them

The

14

The Inspector of Chintamani through an oversight applied for processes only against 5 persons named in the margin of the Government Proceedings sanctioning the prosecution. Steps will be taken to prosecute the husband securing his attendance, as he sometimes appears to reside in his father-in-law's house in British Territory.

(sd) H. H Sparkes.
Deputy Commissioner,
Kolar District.

"Copy

K. Mc Candy
for Inspector General of Police.

Vi

15

In the Court of the District Magistrate of Kolar

The 22nd day of August 1899.

[illegible] No 1533/15

By b 10 89.

Present - H. H. Sparkes Esqr. District Magis.

Criminal Case No. 1 of 1899-1900.

Govt. vs Accused

1. Subbiah

2. Adiappa

3. Narahariappa

4. Kondappa Shastry

5. Bogaram Ranguiah

5/5

Judge.

This is a case under the Infant marriage prevention Regulation No. X of 1894. The accused are prosecuted by the police under section 3 of the above Regulation with the permission of Govt. in proceedings No. 14805 J. 1773 - of 30th June 189

2. Seven witnesses were examined for the prosecution.

1) Mayeshrapa, Barber.

2) Subba, Oddar

3) Aswathanarayappa, School Master

4) Venkatasaiya Shastry, Ryot

5) B. Ramaiya, father of the bride.

6) Ramaiya, Bridegroom.

7) Veerappa, Kurnam.

3. The following exhibits were filed.

a) Authenticated copy of the births and deaths Register of the bride's birth in the Naraganpally village.

b) Horoscope of bride's birth.

4. The accused stated as follows.-

1st accused.

My son 6th witness marrie without consulting me and he arra all the matters appertaining to his marriage himself; he asked me to go to the wedding and I went in company with others. The child before Court is the bride

2nd accused.

I am a divided brother of 1st accused. My nephew came and asked me to lend my house for his marriage and I did so. I had nothing to do with arranging this marriage and know nothing about it.

3rd accused.

I officiated as priest at this marriage; 6th prosecution witness asked me. I only heard of the marriage on that day and had nothing to do with arranging it. I know that girls

below

below 8 years of age should not be married and as the bride struck me as being very young I asked the 5th prosecution witness and 6th witness's eldest brother who showed me a horoscope which showed the girl to be 8 years and 4 months. The horoscope shown me was not the one now shown me as exhibit B; it was in the handwriting of the 4th accused. I don't know whether exhibit B now shown me is a copy of the one I saw at the wedding. The girl's parents and 4th and 5th accused brought the girl from the village

4th accused - states that 5th and 6th witness both came to my village and each presented a horoscope. I examined them and said that they agreed. 6th witness then asked me for a copy of the child's horoscope to show to Narain Shastry in his own village. I gave him a copy and they went away. I know nothing more. I attended the wedding. I did not go to 5th witness's house at any time. - Exhibit B is the original horoscope I received from 5th witness

and

and not the copy I gave to the 6th witness. Prior to the parties coming to my house I knew nothing about the proposed marriage 5th accused states that he had nothing to do with the marriage beyond attending it in company with others, that he did not mix with the company as he had recently lost his cousin and left for his village the next day.

5. The facts of the case are as follows:-

On the 28th august 98 a marriage took place at Iregampally of the Chintamany taluk Mysore territory between Annaya (6th witness) aged 28 and a child Venkatalakshmi aged 7 years and two months and 29 days of Naragampalli of the Pongur taluk in Her Majesty's territory. The facts coming to the knowledge of the police, Government sanction was asked for and obtained to prosecute the abettors of the marriage living in Mysore territory.

6. The main points to be proved are

1) the actual age of the child at the time of marriage

2) whether the accused parties were aware of the actual age of the child and what part they individually took in the marriage.

As regards the 1st point the actual is easily proved by exhibit A. an authenticated copy of the births and deaths

deaths register of the village in which she was born and which makes her age on the date of marriage to be seven years two months and twenty-nine days and which is corroborated by the statement of the 7th witness who kept the births and deaths register at the time.

7. The accused on their part rely entirely upon the horoscope of the child, but from the evidence produced I have every reason to doubt its genuineness; the 5th witness for the prosecution the father of the bride who keeps possession of the horoscope states that the original horoscope which his brother had made out some time before, was lost at the time of marriage and that he does not know what became of it, but that the 4th accused took a copy of it. This witness is an ignorant ryot not knowing to read and write he could not therefore tell whether the 4th accused made a copy of the horoscope or made out another one Exhibit G now produced before the court is stated not to be in the handwriting of the 4th accused, but

but there is nothing to show that it is not a copy of the fictitious one drawn up by him exhibit 6 now shown as the original appears to me to have been quite recently made out and not the original of 7 years old on account of its cleanliness and clearness of writing. I therefore place no trust in it more especially when the difference of time between this horoscope and the Government register can in no way be accounted for. I am therefore of opinion that the 4th accused was instrumental in bringing about this marriage by manufacturing this false horoscope for reasons best known to himself, and that he was perfectly aware of the childs age at the date of marriage. As regards the 1st, 2nd, & 5th accused I cannot find them guilty of any complicity beyond attendance at the wedding as the evidence shows that the 6th witness arranged the marriage entirely himself and there is no reason to doubt it. As regards the 3rd accused he admits that he doubted the age of the girl, but satisfied himself on reading a horoscope shown him. Holding as he

he does the possession of patel and Government servant it was clearly his duty to have satisfied himself still further and not have been satisfied with any scraps of paper shown him; he knew of the existence of the Regulation also of the births and deaths register and it was clearly his duty to have protested against the performance of the marriage until he had thoroughly satisfied himself of the girl's age instead of aiding and abetting the same by officiating as priest.

Finding

The court finds the 3rd and 4th accused guilty of aiding and abetting the marriage of this infant child under section 3 of the Infant Marriage Regulation and directs that the 3rd accused Narahariappah do pay a fine of Rs 5 and in default of payment do undergo simple imprisonment for two weeks

That the 4th accused Kondappa Thathy do pay a fine of Rs 10/ and in default of payment do undergo simple imprisonment for one month.

There

There being insufficient evidence against the 1st accused Subbiah, 2nd accused Adiappa and 5th accused Rangiah they are acquitted under section 245 C. P. C.

Signed/- H. H. Sparkes
District Magistrate
Kolar

Copy

Chandrasekaran
for District Magistrate
Kolar.

SECTION Police

FILE NO. 62498 44

39

Read,

Letter no 1533/125 dated
the 1st October 1849, from
the I. G. of Police in
Mysore, reporting
with reference to
Govt. Pro: 4088/J 348 dated
the 25th Sept. last
that it will be
observed from the
accompanying
Copy of Judgment
delivered
by the D. Magte in
the case of an infant
marriage which
took place at Jigani
palli in the Chunta
mani Taluk, that
out of the 6 ac-
cused noted
whose pros
ecution
was ordered

the conviction only
2 of the 6 persons
as per margin, cu-
cused in the case
of an infant mar-
-riage that took
place at Jigani palli
Chintamani Taluk
that the 1st 2nd & 5th ac-

Subbiah
2. Adiappa
3. Narahariyappa
4. Kondappa Reddy } convicted by Magte
5. D. Rangiah
6 Amiah -

2nd & 4th were ~~convicted~~ sentenced to pay a fine of Rs 5 / 0 and in default thereof to undergo simple imprisonment for 2 weeks and one month respectively; that the 1st 2nd & 5th accused were acquitted for want of sufficient evidence and that through oversight of the Police Inspector of Chintamani, the husband of the infant bride, Annigya, was omitted to be prosecuted.

No: 518/508 dt 17-11-99

It is observed the husband of the infant bride ad of being

in accordance with the sanction conveyed in G.O. No. 14805 dated 9.1773 dt 30th June/88,

The prosecution of the said bridegroom need not now be proceeded with.

E/P 16/11/88

To, The S.P. of Police in Mysore

I do not think it was intended to enforce such persons in future

prosecuted has been examined as a witness for the prosecution. For this irregularity the Police Inspector of Chintamani is responsible and his explanation should be obtained and submitted. The judgment of the Dt. Magte shows that there was an horoscope concocted by the 4th accused, probably in collusion with the bride's father. If so the bridegroom believed the 4th accused's statement & the horoscope and took the age of the girl more than 8 yrs.

page on

he was not to be blamed.
In holding the above
view, the Court deem
it unnecessary to
prosecute the bride-
groom.

Levy:

To,

The I. G. P. of
Police in Mysore.

J 670

1899
6123
2-1-1900

From The Inspector General of Police in Mysore.

To The Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore, General and Revenue Depts.

1

SECTION Police

FILE NO. 67 & J 98-99

Dated 29th
Despatched 30th } December 1899.
Received 2-1-1900

General No. 2528
No. 209

Enclosure Nos One + a file

Forwarding the Explanation of the Police Inspector of Chintamani Taluk in the matter of an infant marriage prosecution, at Irgampally and stating that the omission to prosecute the husband of the infant bride was due to oversight etc

J 1/1
2/1/1900 References pended upon

Submitted
2/1/1900

the Deputy Commissioner Kolar District together with its enclosures in original being the explanation of the Police Jamadar Venkataramana Naidu of Siddaghatta Taluk, who was then acting as Inspector of the Chintamani Taluk.

2. It will be observed from the above that as stated by the Deputy Commissioner the Acting Inspector took out processes only against the persons noted in the margin of the Government Proceedings No 1450S / 1773 dated 30th June 1899 omitting by oversight the husband Annaya who was referred to in the body of the Proceedings. The Inspector does not know English and the Canarese order of the Superintendent forwarding Copy of the Government Proceedings did not clearly specify the names of the persons to be prosecuted. This omission should have been noticed by the Police Superintendent on his office if the investigation proceedings had been properly supervised. The

30

The District Magistrate who heard the case also apparently failed to detect the mistake

Under these circumstances the undersigned thinks the case does not appear to have been properly handled from start to finish and that the Superintendent of Police of Kolar District is equally to blame for the irregularity

Y. V. Krishnamurti
Jr Inspector General of Police

Enc. to No 2528/209 of 29/30/12/99

1899-900 31

From The Deputy Commissioner Kolar District

(1/6)

To The Inspector General of Police in Mysore

Dated 18th

Despatched December 1899

Received

General No. 157
No.

Enclosure No. 3

His no: 2090/130 dated 20th November 1899 calling for the explanation of Police Inspector Chenitamani in the matter of an Infant marriage prosecution as per Government order no: 5718/9.508 dated 17th November 1899

With reference to the above, I have the honor to forward herewith, in original, the explanation received from the Police Jamadar Venkatramana Naidu of

of Siddlaghatta Taluq who was the acting Inspector in Chintamani Taluq at the time when the marriage prosecution under correspondence was launched together with the Amildar's notes

The acting Inspector seems to have paid attention only to the names of marginally noted persons in the Government Proceedings No: 14505/G.1773 dated 30th June 1899, and lost sight of the last line in the body of the said Proceedings which sanctions the prosecution of the husband Ammiya also, a copy of which was furnished to him as will be seen from the Copy of the Kannarese order herein enclosed

(Signed) C. Narayana Rao
For Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District

"Copy"

H. V. [illegible]
for Inspector General of Police

Proceedings of the Government of Mysore

Read:-

Letter no. 1533/125 dated the 13th October 1899 from the Inspector General of police in Mysore, reporting with reference to the conviction of only 2 of the 6 persons as per margin concerned in the case of an Infant Marriage

1 Babbiah
2 Adiappa
3 Narahariyappa : Convicted by Magistrate
4 Kondappa Battey
5 B. Ranglah
6 Anniah

that took place at Irgam-palli Chintamani Taluk that the 1st 2nd and 5th Accused were Acquitted by the District Magistrate for want of sufficient evidence and that, through the oversight of the Police Inspector of Chintamani, the husband of the Infant bride Annigga was omitted to be prosecuted

---

Order thereon no 5718/T 508 dated Bangalore 17th November 1899

It is observed that the husband of the infant bride, instead of being prosecuted in accordance with the sanction conveyed in Government Proceedings no 4825/T 1773 dated 30th June 1899, has been examined as a witness for the prosecution. For this irregularity the Police Inspector of Chintamani is responsible and his explanation should be obtained and submitted

The 34 prosecution of the paid vernacular need not now be proceeded with

(Sd) S. Ananthasami Row
for Secretary

Office of the Inspector General of police in Mysore.
Bangalore D/ 20 November 1899

No. 2090/130 Copy of the above is forwarded to the Deputy Commissioner, Kolar for the submission of the explanation of the Inspector of the Chintamani Taluk, called for in the above

(Sd) K. Chendy
for Inspector General of police

Memo no. 54 Office of the Dy Commr
Police Dept Kolar Dated 27.11.99

Forwarded to the Amildar of Chintamany for information and submission of the Explanation called for in the above

for Deputy Commissioner
Kolar district

Enc. 4 No 2546 dt. 30/12/99

To

The Chief Engineer (Civil) Hyderabad

Sir,

Sub: Submission of Tenders for the work of

Ref: Your Tender Notification No. dt.

I am submitting herewith the Tenders for the above mentioned work in sealed covers.

Yours faithfully,

Encl: As above

Dt. 6-12-99

Contractor

Address

Rs. 13 12 99

Rs. 65 681

Rs. 12 99

Rs. 13 12 99

1. Rs. 12 99

2. Rs. 12 99

3. Rs. 12 99

4. Rs. 12 99

5. Rs. 12 99

6. Rs. 12 99

7. Rs. 12 99

8. Rs. 12 99

9. Rs. 12 99

10. Rs. 12 99

11. Rs. 12 99

12. Rs. 12 99

13. Rs. 12 99

ਸੇਵਾ ਵਿਖੇ,

ਸ਼੍ਰੀਮਾਨ ਜੀ,

ਬੇਨਤੀ ਹੈ ਕਿ ਮੈਂ ਆਪ ਦੇ ਦਫ਼ਤਰ ਵਿਚ ਕਲਰਕ ਦੀ ਅਸਾਮੀ ਲਈ ਦਰਖ਼ਾਸਤ ਦਿੱਤੀ ਸੀ ਜੋ ਆਪ ਨੇ ਮਨਜ਼ੂਰ ਕਰ ਲਈ ਹੈ। ਮੈਂ ਆਪ ਦੇ ਦਫ਼ਤਰ ਵਿਚ ਹਾਜ਼ਰ ਹੋਣ ਲਈ ਤਿਆਰ ਹਾਂ। ਮੈਂ ਆਪ ਨੂੰ ਵਿਸ਼ਵਾਸ ਦਿਵਾਉਂਦਾ ਹਾਂ ਕਿ ਮੈਂ ਆਪਣੀ ਡਿਊਟੀ ਪੂਰੀ ਮਿਹਨਤ ਅਤੇ ਲਗਨ ਨਾਲ ਕਰਾਂਗਾ ਅਤੇ ਆਪ ਨੂੰ ਕੋਈ ਸ਼ਿਕਾਇਤ ਦਾ ਮੌਕਾ ਨਹੀਂ ਦਿਆਂਗਾ।

ਮੇਰੀ ਤਨਖ਼ਾਹ ਦੇ ਸੰਬੰਧ ਵਿਚ ਮੈਂ ਆਪ ਨੂੰ ਦੱਸ ਦੇਣਾ ਚਾਹੁੰਦਾ ਹਾਂ ਕਿ ਮੈਂ ਇਸ ਸਮੇਂ ਪੰਜ ਸੌ ਰੁਪਏ ਮਹੀਨਾ ਤਨਖ਼ਾਹ ਲੈ ਰਿਹਾ ਹਾਂ। ਇਸ ਲਈ ਮੈਂ ਆਪ ਤੋਂ ਪ੍ਰਾਰਥਨਾ ਕਰਦਾ ਹਾਂ ਕਿ ਮੈਨੂੰ ਇਸ ਤੋਂ ਘੱਟ ਤਨਖ਼ਾਹ ਨਾ ਦਿੱਤੀ ਜਾਵੇ।

ਆਪ ਦਾ ਆਗਿਆਕਾਰੀ ਸੇਵਕ

ਹਸਤਾਖਰ

ਪਤਾ ਅਤੇ ਟੈਲੀਫ਼ੋਨ ਨੰਬਰ

ਮਿਤੀ 16/12/1999

ਸੇਵਾ ਵਿਖੇ,

ਸ਼੍ਰੀਮਾਨ ਜੀ,

ਬੇਨਤੀ ਹੈ ਕਿ ਮੈਂ ਆਪ ਦੇ ਦਫ਼ਤਰ ਵਿਚ ਕਲਰਕ ਦੀ ਅਸਾਮੀ ਲਈ ਦਰਖ਼ਾਸਤ ਦਿੱਤੀ ਸੀ ਜੋ ਆਪ ਨੇ ਮਨਜ਼ੂਰ ਕਰ ਲਈ ਹੈ। ਮੈਂ ਆਪ ਦੇ ਦਫ਼ਤਰ ਵਿਚ ਹਾਜ਼ਰ ਹੋਣ ਲਈ ਤਿਆਰ ਹਾਂ। ਮੈਂ ਆਪ ਨੂੰ ਵਿਸ਼ਵਾਸ ਦਿਵਾਉਂਦਾ ਹਾਂ ਕਿ ਮੈਂ ਆਪਣੀ ਡਿਊਟੀ ਪੂਰੀ ਮਿਹਨਤ ਅਤੇ ਲਗਨ ਨਾਲ ਕਰਾਂਗਾ ਅਤੇ ਆਪ ਨੂੰ ਕੋਈ ਸ਼ਿਕਾਇਤ ਦਾ ਮੌਕਾ ਨਹੀਂ ਦਿਆਂਗਾ।

ਮੇਰੀ ਤਨਖ਼ਾਹ ਦੇ ਸੰਬੰਧ ਵਿਚ ਮੈਂ ਆਪ ਨੂੰ ਦੱਸ ਦੇਣਾ ਚਾਹੁੰਦਾ ਹਾਂ ਕਿ ਮੈਂ ਇਸ ਸਮੇਂ ਪੰਜ ਸੌ ਰੁਪਏ ਮਹੀਨਾ ਤਨਖ਼ਾਹ ਲੈ ਰਿਹਾ ਹਾਂ। ਇਸ ਲਈ ਮੈਂ ਆਪ ਤੋਂ ਪ੍ਰਾਰਥਨਾ ਕਰਦਾ ਹਾਂ ਕਿ ਮੈਨੂੰ ਇਸ ਤੋਂ ਘੱਟ ਤਨਖ਼ਾਹ ਨਾ ਦਿੱਤੀ ਜਾਵੇ।

ਆਪ ਦਾ ਆਗਿਆਕਾਰੀ ਸੇਵਕ

ਹਸਤਾਖਰ

ਪਤਾ ਅਤੇ ਟੈਲੀਫ਼ੋਨ ਨੰਬਰ

ਮਿਤੀ 16/12/1999

[illegible]

[illegible]

5.12.99

[illegible]

Submitted

The Jamadar does not receive the Civil Officer's copy of the Government Order received from Collector's Proceedings No 14 of 05 printed at page 39 of Proceedings Book for June 99. Shows that Sanction was accorded to the prosecution of Subbiah & four others. The Jamadar explains that the name of Annayya, Accused from, was not mentioned in the orders given by him.

C. Narayana
Jamadar

7/12/99.

Proceedings of the Govt of Mysore

Read:-

Letter no 4623-389 J
the 15th June 1899 from the Inspector
General of Police in Mysore, reporting
that on the 29th August 1898 an
infant girl of 7 years, 2 months
and 29 days old named Venkata
Lakshmi, daughter of Bochu
Ramaiah of Hirgampalli, Punganur
Taluk, North Arcot District
was married to one Annigappa aged
28 years, Son of Komati Subbaya
of Hirgampalli, Chittoor and Taluq
at Hirgampalli

Order thereon no 4805
J 1773
Dated Bangalore 30th June 1899.

Under the provisions of
Section 8 of Regulation X of 1894
the Govt are pleased to direct
the

the prosecution, for offences
under Section 3 of the Mysore
Infant Marriages Prevention
Regulation of the Magistrate
naked persons who caused
the marriage of the infant
girl named Venkatalakshmi
with a man named Annaja
or knowingly aided and abetted
the same, and of the said hus-
band Annaja

1. Subadar, Sultan's Tulla Troopers
2. Adjutant, Tulla Troopers
3. Naib Tahsildar, Chickballapur
4. Sandapatta Sadar
5. Rayaram Rangiah } Sultans

(sd) K. Anantaramiah
for Secretary

Office of the Inspector General of Police
Dated Bangalore 5th July 1895.

No 66
4

Copy of the above is forwarded to the Deputy Commissioner Kolar with a request that the record of the proceedings may be forwarded to this office.

The Vernacular records are herewith returned.

(sd) K. Chandy
for Inspr General of Police

1891

Dist. Magistrate's
Court
Kola
Dated 9th July 1899.

No 54
22

Copy of the above is forwarded to the Police Superintendent Kolar District for necessary action.

(Sd) H. H. Sparke,
District Magistrate
Kolar.

True Copy
(Initialled) C. J. H.

"Copy" be returned

Subd. to Asst. Dr. Forms
for appl. 12/1.

12784
appl. as attend
Jour. : MS
Print 4/L
Clear 13/1/1.

13/1/1900

Subd. 13/1.

ACTION--- police
FILE No.--67 A 98-99
SERIAL No.--41.

Read
Letter No 2528
dt 29
dt 29th Dec/99 from
the Insp-Genl. of
Police in Mysore.
(Print in extenso)

Order:— No. 8210-20 dt 18-1-1900
748
The explanation
of the late Asst. Insp-
of Chintamani
cannot be deemed
satisfactory &
the Govt. regret
to observe that
the blame for
the irregularity

113
under notice does
not stop short
with him but
the Supt. should
give details in-
structions to the
Police but
so far from doing so
he contents him-
self with simply
forwarding a copy
of the Govt. Prop
No. 14105 of 30th June/55
No. 91773
under cover of a
Kannada order
to Amildars &
Circlemen, Dist
did not even write

Applicant member of the
the names of the
parties who kept
parties to be pro
secuted - and It
was this omission
which has in no
small degree ca
-tributed to the
failure to prosecute
the husband of the
infant bride. It is
disappointing that
the latter omission
was not noticed by
the Ld. Mayor who
tried the case and
Sd. trust that
such cases will
future be handled

4s.
with greater care.

Sick.

To The G. of Police.
Dr Magt. of Koln
& other District Magistrates